arXiv:1609.05348v1 [math.CO] 17 Sep 2016

Automorphism groups of a class of cubic Cayley graphs on symmetric groups*

Xueyi Huang, Qiongxiang Huang†, Lu Lu

College of Mathematics and Systems Science, Xinjiang University, Urumqi, Xinjiang 830046, P. R. China

Abstract Let S_n denote the symmetric group of degree n with $n \geq 3$. Set $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots\ n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$. Let $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ be the Cayley graph on S_n with respect to S. In this paper, we show that Γ_n ($n \geq 13$) is a normal Cayley graph, and that the full automorphism group of Γ_n is equal to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) = R(S_n) \rtimes \langle \mathrm{Inn}(\phi) \rangle \cong S_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, where $R(S_n)$ is the right regular representation of S_n, $\phi = (1\ 2)(3\ n)(4\ n-1)(5\ n-2)\cdots\ (\in S_n)$, and $\mathrm{Inn}(\phi)$ is the inner isomorphism of S_n induced by ϕ.

Keywords: Cayley graph; Normal; Automorphism group

AMS Classification: 05C25

1 Introduction

Let G be a finite group, and S a subset of G with $e \notin S$ (e is the identity element of G) and $S = S^{-1}$. The *Cayley graph* on G with respect to S, denoted by $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$, is defined to be the undirected graph with vertex set G, and with an edge connecting $g, h \in G$ if $hg^{-1} \in S$. Denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ the automorphism groups of $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ and G, respectively. The *right regular representation* of the group G is defined as $R(G) = \{r_g : x \mapsto xg\ (\forall x \in G) \mid g \in G\}$. Clearly, $R(G)$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))$ and so every Cayley graph is vertex-transitive. Furthermore, the group $\mathrm{Aut}(G, S) = \{\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G) \mid S^\sigma = S\}$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))_e$, the stabilizer of the identity vertex e in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))$, and so is also a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))$. The Cayley graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is said to be *normal* if $R(G)$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))$. Godsil in [11] proved that $N_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G,S))}(R(G)) = R(G) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(G, S)$, which implies that $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is normal if and only if $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)) = R(G) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(G, S)$.

To determine the full automorphism groups of Cayley graphs is a basic problem in algebraic graph theory. As normal Cayley graphs are just those which have the smallest possible full automorphism groups, to determine the normality of Cayley graphs is an important problem in the literature [19]. The whole information about the normality of Cayley graphs on the cyclic groups of prime order, the groups of order twice a prime,

*This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11671344, 11261059 and 11531011).

†Corresponding author. E-mail: huangqx@xju.edu.cn, huangqxmath@163.com.

a prime-square and a product of two distinct primes were obtained by Alspach [1], Du et al. [3], Dobson et al. [2] and Lu et al. [17], respectively. For more results regarding automorphism groups and normality of Cayley graphs, we refer the reader to [7, 19] and references therein.

Let S_n and A_n denote the symmetric group and alternating group of degree n, respectively. In the past few years the problem of determining the full automorphism groups of Cayley graphs on S_n and A_n has received considerable attention (see, for example, [4–6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 20, 21]). This is mainly due to the fact that the Cayley graphs, especially those on S_n and A_n, are widely used as models for interconnection networks [14, 16]. It is well known that $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots\ n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ can generate S_n. Thus $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ is a connected graph. The directed graph $\mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S' = \{c_n, (1\ 2)\})$ for even $n \geq 4$ has been used to provide an infinite family of non-hamiltonian directed Cayley graphs (see [12], Corollary 3.8.2). It motivates us to consider the problem of determining the full automorphism group of $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$.

In this paper, it is shown that Γ_n ($n \geq 13$) is a normal Cayley graph, and that the full automorphism group of Γ_n is equal to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) = R(S_n) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S) = R(S_n) \rtimes \langle \mathrm{Inn}(\phi) \rangle \cong S_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, where $R(S_n)$ is the right regular representation of S_n, $\phi = (1\ 2)(3\ n)(4\ n-1)(5\ n-2)\cdots\ (\in S_n)$, and $\mathrm{Inn}(\phi)$ is the inner isomorphism of S_n induced by ϕ. Besides, we also provide the full automorphism group of Γ_n for $3 \leq n \leq 8$ with the help of the package "grape" of GAP4 [10].

2 Main Results

The main goal of this section is to determine the full automorphism group of Γ_n. First of all, we need the following crucial criterion for a Cayley graph to be normal.

Lemma 2.1 ([19]). *Let* $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ *be the Cayley graph on* G *with respect to* S. *Then* $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ *is normal if and only if* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))_e = \mathrm{Aut}(G, S)$.

For connected Cayley graphs, the above criterion could be simplified as follows, which is well-known and easily verified by oneself.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* G *be a finite group, and let* S $(e \notin S)$ *be a symmetric generating set of* G. *Then* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))_e = \mathrm{Aut}(G, S)$ *if and only if* $(st)^\sigma = s^\sigma t^\sigma$ *holds for any* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Cay}(G, S))_e$ *and* $s, t \in S$.

The following lemma gives the automorphism group of S_n, which is useful for us to determine the full automorphism group of Γ_n.

Lemma 2.3 ([18], Chapter 3, Theorems 2.17–2.20). *If* $n \geq 3$ *and* $n \neq 6$, *then* $\mathrm{Aut}(S_n) = \mathrm{Inn}(S_n) \cong S_n$. *If* $n = 6$, *then* $|\mathrm{Aut}(S_n) : \mathrm{Inn}(S_n)| = 2$, *and each element in* $\mathrm{Aut}(S_n) \setminus \mathrm{Inn}(S_n)$ *maps a transposition to a product of three disjoint transpositions.*

The following two lemmas provide a main tool for us to prove the normality of Γ_n.

Lemma 2.4. *Let* $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots\ n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ *and* $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ $(n \geq 13)$. *Then there is an unique* 12*-cycle in* Γ_n *passing through* e, c_n *and* c_n^{-1} *which is shown in (6).*

Proof. Assume that $C = (e, c_n, s_1c_n, s_2s_1c_n, \ldots, s_{10}\cdots s_2s_1c_n = c_n^{-1}, c_ns_{10}\cdots s_2s_1c_n = e)$ is an arbitrary 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}, where $s_i \in S$ for $1 \le i \le 10$. Since C is a cycle, we have $s_1 \ne c_n^{-1}$, $s_i \ne s_{i-1}^{-1}$ for $2 \le i \le 10$ and $s_{10} \ne c_n^{-1}$. Thus there exists a positive integer k such that C is determined by the equation

$$e = c_ns_{10}\cdots s_2s_1c_n = c_n^{i_k}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_{k-1}}(1\ 2)\cdots c_n^{i_3}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_2}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1}, \tag{1}$$

where $i_1 \ge 1$, $i_k \ge 1$, $|i_l| \ge 1$ for $l = 2, 3, \ldots, k-1$ and $i_1 + |i_2| + \cdots + |i_{k-1}| + i_k + k - 1 = 12$. Clearly, we have $k \le 6$. If $k = 1$, then (1) is equivalent to $e = c_n^{12}$, which is impossible because $n \ge 13$. Therefore, we have $2 \le k \le 6$. Let $u_0 = (1\ 2)$ and $u_l = c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{l-1}-i_l}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{l-1}+i_l}$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$. Then $u_l = c_n^{-i_l}u_{l-1}c_n^{i_l}$ for $l = 1, \ldots, k-1$, and so (1) becomes

$$e = c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k}u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1, \tag{2}$$

or equivalently,

$$c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{k-1}-i_k} = u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1. \tag{3}$$

Note that $i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{k-1} + i_k \in [-\sum_{l=1}^k |i_l|, \sum_{l=1}^k |i_l|] \subseteq [-12, 12] \subset [-n, n]$ because $\sum_{l=1}^k |i_l| \le 12$ and $n \ge 13$. Therefore, if $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k \ne 0$, then $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$, and so $|\mathrm{supp}(c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{k-1}-i_k})| = |\mathrm{supp}(c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k})| = n \ge 13$. However, $|\mathrm{supp}(u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1)| \le 2(k-1) \le 10$, which is a contradiction according to (3). Thus $i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_{k-1} + i_k = 0$. From (2) we have

$$u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1 = e. \tag{4}$$

Clearly, $k = 3$ or 5 since $2 \le k \le 6$ and e is an even permutation.

If $k = 3$, then $i_1 + |i_2| + i_3 = 10$ and $i_1 + i_2 + i_3 = 0$, implying that $i_2 = -5$, and $\{i_1, i_3\} = \{2, 3\}$ or $\{1, 4\}$ because $i_1, i_3 \ge 1$. In the former case, if $i_1 = 2$ then $u_1 = c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2 = (3\ 4)$ and $u_2 = c_n^{-i_2}u_1c_n^{i_2} = c_n^5(3\ 4)c_n^{-5} = (n{-}2\ n{-}1)$, which gives that $u_2u_1 = (n{-}2\ n{-}1)(3\ 4) \ne e$, contrary to (4); if $i_1 = 3$, similarly, we have $u_2u_1 = (n-1\ n)(4\ 5) \ne e$, also contrary to (4). In the later case, one can also deduce a contradiction in the same way.

If $k = 5$, then $i_1 + |i_2| + |i_3| + |i_4| + i_5 = 8$ and $i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 = 0$. Since $i_1, i_5 \ge 1$, it is easy to see that there are seven types of solutions satisfying these conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \text{I-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{1, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-4, 1, 1\}; \\ \text{II-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{1, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-3, -1, 2\}; \\ \text{III-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{1, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-2, -2, 2\}; \\ \text{IV-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{2, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-3, -1, 1\}; \\ \text{V-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{2, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-2, -2, 1\}; \\ \text{VI-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{2, 2\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-2, -1, -1\}; \\ \text{VII-type:} & \{i_1, i_5\} = \{3, 1\},\ \{i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{-2, -1, -1\}. \end{cases}$$

For I-type and II-type, since $i_1 = i_5 = 1$, we have $u_1 = c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n = (2\ 3)$ and $u_4 = c_n^{-i_1-i_2-i_3-i_4}(1\ 2)\ c_n^{i_1+i_2+i_3+i_4} = c_n^{i_5}(1\ 2)c_n^{-i_5} = c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1} = (n\ 1)$, which gives that $\{u_2, u_3\} = \{(2\ 3), (n\ 1)\}$ due to $u_4u_3u_2u_1 = e$. If $u_2 = (2\ 3)$, from $u_2 = c_n^{-i_2}u_1c_n^{i_2}$ we deduce that $i_2 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_2 = (n\ 1)$, similarly, one can deduce that $i_2 = -2$, which is impossible because $\{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{-4, 1, 1\}$ or $\{-3, -1, 2\}$.

For III-type, we also have $u_1 = (2\ 3)$, $u_4 = (n\ 1)$ and $\{u_2, u_3\} = \{(2\ 3), (n\ 1)\}$. If $u_2 = (2\ 3)$, from $u_2 = c_n^{-i_2} u_1 c_n^{i_2}$ we get $i_2 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_2 = (n\ 1)$, then $u_3 = (2, 3)$. This implies that $i_2 = -2$, $i_3 = 2$ and $i_4 = -2$, and so (1) becomes

$$c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n = e, \tag{5}$$

which holds naturally because $(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2 = (1\ 2)(3\ 4)$ is of order 2. This leads to a possible 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}, namely

$$\begin{aligned} C \ = \ & (e, c_n, (1\ 2)c_n, c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n, c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, (1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, \\ & c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, (1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n, \\ & c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n = (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n = c_n^{-1}, \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n = e). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It is easy to verify that C is exactly a 12-cycle.

For IV-type and V-type, we have $u_1 = (3\ 4)$ and $u_4 = (n\ 1)$ or $u_1 = (2\ 3)$ and $u_4 = (n-1\ n)$. In the former case, we get $\{u_2, u_3\} = \{(3\ 4), (n\ 1)\}$. If $u_2 = (3\ 4)$, then $i_2 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_2 = (n\ 1)$, then $u_3 = (3\ 4)$, implying that $i_3 = 3$, which is impossible. In the later case, one can deduce a contradiction in the same way.

For VI-type, we have $u_1 = (3\ 4)$ and $u_4 = (n-1\ n)$. Then $\{u_2, u_3\} = \{(3\ 4), (n-1\ n)\}$. If $u_2 = (3\ 4)$, then $i_2 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_2 = (n-1\ n)$, then $i_2 = -4$, which is impossible.

For VII-type, we have $u_1 = (4\ 5)$ and $u_4 = (n\ 1)$ or $u_1 = (2\ 3)$ and $u_4 = (n-2\ n-1)$. In the former case, we obtain $\{u_2, u_3\} = \{(4\ 5), (n\ 1)\}$. If $u_2 = (4\ 5)$, then $i_2 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_2 = (n\ 1)$, then $i_2 = -4$, which is impossible. In the later case, similarly, one can also deduce a contradiction.

Summarizing the above discussions, we conclude that there is an unique 12-cycle, which is shown in (6), in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}.

We complete the proof. □

Remark 1. If $n = 12$, there is another 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1} due to $c_n^{12} = e$. Thus the condition $n \geq 13$ in Lemma 2.4 is necessary.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ *and* $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ *(*$n \geq 13$*). Then there are exactly two* 12*-cycles in* Γ_n *passing through* e, $(1\ 2)$ *and* c_n *(resp.* e, $(1\ 2)$ *and* c_n^{-1}*), which are shown in (12) and (14) (resp. (15) and (16)).*

Proof. Assume that $C = (e, (1\ 2), s_1(1\ 2), s_2s_1(1\ 2), \ldots, s_{10}\cdots s_2s_1(1\ 2) = c_n, c_n^{-1}s_{10}\cdots s_2s_1(1\ 2) = e)$ is an arbitrary 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n, where $s_i \in S$ for $1 \leq i \leq 10$. Since C is a cycle, we have $s_1 \neq (1\ 2)$, $s_i \neq s_{i-1}^{-1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq 10$ and $s_{10} \neq c_n$. Thus there exists a positive integer k such that C is determined by the equation

$$e = c_n^{-1}s_{10}\cdots s_2s_1(1\ 2) = c_n^{i_k}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_{k-1}}(1\ 2)\cdots c_n^{i_3}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_2}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1}(1\ 2), \tag{7}$$

where $i_k \leq -1$, $|i_l| \geq 1$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ and $|i_1| + |i_2| + \cdots + |i_{k-1}| - i_k + k = 12$. Clearly, we have $k \leq 6$. If $k = 1$, then (7) is equivalent to $e = c_n^{-11}(1\ 2)$, which is impossible. Therefore, we have $2 \leq k \leq 6$. Let $u_0 = (1\ 2)$ and $u_l = c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{l-1}-i_l}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{l-1}+i_l}$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$. Then $u_l = c_n^{-i_l}u_{l-1}c_n^{i_l}$ for $l = 1, \ldots, k-1$, and so (7) becomes

$$e = c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k}u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1(1\ 2), \tag{8}$$

or equivalently,

$$c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{k-1}-i_k} = u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1(1\ 2). \tag{9}$$

Note that $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k \in [-\sum_{l=1}^k |i_l|, \sum_{l=1}^k |i_l|] \subseteq [-12, 12] \subset [-n, n]$ because $\sum_{l=1}^k |i_l| \le 12$ and $n \ge 13$. Therefore, if $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k \neq 0$, then $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$, and so $|\mathrm{supp}(c_n^{-i_1-i_2-\cdots-i_{k-1}-i_k})| = |\mathrm{supp}(c_n^{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k})| = n \ge 13$. However, $|\mathrm{supp}(u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1(1\ 2))| \le 2(k-1)+2 \le 12$, contrary to (9). Thus $i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k-1}+i_k = 0$. From (8) we have

$$u_{k-1}\cdots u_3u_2u_1(1\ 2) = e. \tag{10}$$

Clearly, $k = 2$, 4 or 6 since $2 \le k \le 6$ and e is an even permutation.

If $k = 2$, then $|i_1| - i_2 = 10$ and $i_1 + i_2 = 0$, implying that $i_1 = 5$ and $i_2 = -5$. Then $u_1 = c_n^{-5}(1\ 2)c_n^5 = (6\ 7)$, and so $u_1(1\ 2) = (6\ 7)(1\ 2) \neq e$, contrary to (10).

If $k = 4$, then $|i_1| + |i_2| + |i_3| - i_4 = 8$ and $i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 = 0$. It is easy to see that there are four types of solutions satisfying these conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \text{I-type:} & i_4 = -1,\ \{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{4, -2, -1\},\ \{3, -3, 1\} \text{ or } \{-3, 2, 2\}; \\ \text{II-type:} & i_4 = -2,\ \{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{4, -1, -1\}, \{3, -2, 1\} \text{ or } \{2, 2, -2\}; \\ \text{III-type:} & i_4 = -3,\ \{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{3, 1, -1\} \text{ or } \{2, 2, -1\}; \\ \text{IV-type:} & i_4 = -4,\ \{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{2, 1, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

For I-type, since $i_4 = -1$, we have $u_3 = c_n^{-i_1-i_2-i_3}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1+i_2+i_3} = c_n^{i_4}(1\ 2)c_n^{-i_4} = c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n = (2\ 3)$. Since $u_3u_2u_1(1\ 2) = e$, we get $u_2u_1 = (2\ 3)(1\ 2) = (1\ 2\ 3)$, which implies that $u_2 = (1\ 2)$ and $u_1 = (1\ 3)$, $u_2 = (1\ 3)$ and $u_1 = (2\ 3)$, or $u_2 = (2\ 3)$ and $u_1 = (1\ 2)$. The first two cases cannot occur because both $\mathrm{supp}(u_1)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(u_2)$ must contain two consecutive points. The last case also cannot occur due to $i_1 \neq 0$.

For II-type, as above, we have $u_3 = (3\ 4)$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{(1\ 2), (3\ 4)\}$. If $u_1 = (1\ 2)$, then from $u_1 = c_n^{-i_1}(1\ 2)c_n^{i_1}$ we get $i_1 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_1 = (3\ 4)$, then $u_2 = (1\ 2)$. This gives that $i_1 = 2$, $i_2 = -2$ and $i_3 = 2$, and so (7) becomes

$$c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2) = e, \tag{11}$$

which holds naturally because $c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2) = (3\ 4)(1\ 2)$ is of order 2. Thus there is a possible 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n, namely

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 = {} & (e, (1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2), c_n^2(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n, c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2), c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2), \\ & (1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2), c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2), \\ & (1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2) = c_n^2, c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2) = c_n, \\ & c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2) = e). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

It is easy to verify that C_1 is exactly a 12-cycle.

For III-type, we have $u_3 = (4\ 5)$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{(1\ 2), (4\ 5)\}$. If $u_1 = (1\ 2)$, then $i_1 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_1 = (4\ 5)$, then $u_2 = (1\ 2)$, and so $i_1 = 3$, $i_2 = -3$ and $i_3 = 3$, which is impossible because $\{i_1, i_2, i_3\} = \{3, 1, -1\}$ or $\{2, 2, -1\}$.

For IV-type, we have $u_3 = (5\ 6)$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{(1\ 2), (5\ 6)\}$. If $u_1 = (1\ 2)$, then $i_1 = 0$, a contradiction. If $u_1 = (5\ 6)$, then $i_1 = 4$, which is impossible.

If $k = 6$, then $|i_1| + |i_2| + |i_3| + |i_4| + |i_5| - i_6 = 6$ and $i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 + i_6 = 0$. Since $i_6 \leq -1$ and $|i_l| \geq 1$ for $l = 1, \ldots, 5$, we have $i_6 = -1$ and $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5\} = \{1, 1, 1, -1, -1\}$. Then, by simple computation, we see that the only solution of (7) is $(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6) = (1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1)$, i.e.,

$$c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2) = e, \tag{13}$$

which holds naturally because $c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2) = (1\ 2\ 3)$ is of order 3. Therefore, there exists another possible 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 \ = \ & (e, (1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), \\ & c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2), \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2) = (1\ 2)c_n, \\ & (1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2) = c_n, \\ & c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2) = e). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

It is easy to verify that C_2 is exactly a 12-cycle.

Summarizing the above discussions, we see that there are exactly two 12-cycles in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}, namely the cycles C_1 and C_2 shown in (12) and (14), respectively.

Similarly, one can show that there are exactly two 12-cycles in Γ_n passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n^{-1}, namely the cycles

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^* \ = \ & (e, (1\ 2), c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}, c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), \\ & c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), \\ & c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2) = c_n^{-2}, \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2) = c_n^{-1}, c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2) = e) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^* \ = \ & (e, (1\ 2), c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), \\ & c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), (1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2), \\ & c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}, \\ & (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = c_n^{-1}, \\ & c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = e) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

which are determined by the equalities

$$c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2)c_n^2(1\ 2)c_n^{-2}(1\ 2) = e \tag{17}$$

and

$$c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2)c_n(1\ 2)c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = e \tag{18}$$

respectively.

We complete the proof. □

Combining Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we now prove that Γ_n is a normal Cayley graph.



Fig. 1: Local structure of Γ_n.

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \dots n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ *and* $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ *(*$n \geq 13$*). Then* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)_e = \mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S)$*, or equivalently,* Γ_n *is a normal Cayley graph.*

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)_e$. Firstly, we claim that $(1\ 2)^\sigma = (1\ 2)$. In fact, if $(1\ 2)^\sigma \neq (1\ 2)$, without loss of generality, we assume that $(1\ 2)^\sigma = c_n$. Then $c_n^\sigma = (1\ 2)$ and $(c_n^{-1})^\sigma = c_n^{-1}$ or $c_n^\sigma = c_n^{-1}$ and $(c_n^{-1})^\sigma = (1\ 2)$ because $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)_e$ fixes S setwise. Since σ sents 12-cycles to 12-cycles, by Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, both of the two cases cannot occur because in Γ_n there are only one 12-cycle passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1} while there are two 12-cycles passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n (resp. e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n^{-1}).

To prove our result, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, it suffices to show that $(st)^\sigma = s^\sigma t^\sigma$ for any $s, t \in S$. As $(1\ 2)^\sigma = (1\ 2)$, we just need to consider the following two cases.

Case 1. $c_n^\sigma = c_n$ and $(c_n^{-1})^\sigma = c_n^{-1}$;

By Lemma 2.4, there is an unique 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}, namely the cycle $C = (e, c_n, (1\ 2)c_n, \dots, (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}, c_n^{-1}, e)$ shown in (6). Then $C^\sigma = (e^\sigma, c_n^\sigma, ((1\ 2)c_n)^\sigma, \dots, ((1\ 2)c_n^{-1})^\sigma, (c_n^{-1})^\sigma, e^\sigma) = (e, c_n, ((1\ 2)c_n)^\sigma, \dots, ((1\ 2)c_n^{-1})^\sigma, c_n^{-1}, e)$ is also a 12-cycle passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1}. By the uniqueness of the 12-cycle, we obtain

$$((1\ 2)c_n)^\sigma = (1\ 2)c_n = (1\ 2)^\sigma c_n^\sigma \text{ and } ((1\ 2)c_n^{-1})^\sigma = (1\ 2)c_n^{-1} = (1\ 2)^\sigma (c_n^{-1})^\sigma. \tag{19}$$

Furthermore, σ fixes c_n and c_n^{-1}, and so fixes their neighborhoods $N_{\Gamma_n}(c_n) = \{e, (1\ 2)c_n, c_n^2\}$ and $N_{\Gamma_n}(c_n^{-1}) = \{e, (1\ 2)c_n^{-1}, c_n^{-2}\}$ setwise (see Fig. 1), respectively. Then, by (19), we get

$$(c_n^2)^\sigma = c_n^2 = c_n^\sigma c_n^\sigma \text{ and } (c_n^{-2})^\sigma = c_n^{-2} = (c_n^{-1})^\sigma (c_n^{-1})^\sigma. \tag{20}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.5, there are exactly two 12-cycles passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n, namely $C_1 = (e, (1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2), \dots, c_n^2, c_n, e)$ and $C_2 = (e, (1\ 2), c_n(1\ 2), \dots, (1\ 2)c_n, c_n, e)$ shown in (12) and (14), respectively. Note that both C_1 and C_2 pass through $c_n(1\ 2)$. As σ fixes e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n, and sents 12-cycles to 12-cycles, we have

$$(c_n(1\ 2))^\sigma = c_n(1\ 2) = c_n^\sigma (1\ 2)^\sigma. \tag{21}$$

Similarly, by considering the 12-cycles C_1^* and C_2^* (see (15) and (16)) passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n^{-1}, we get

$$(c_n^{-1}(1\ 2))^\sigma = c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = (c_n^{-1})^\sigma (1\ 2)^\sigma. \tag{22}$$

Also, it is obvious that

$$((1\ 2)^2)^\sigma = e^\sigma = e = (1\ 2)(1\ 2) = (1\ 2)^\sigma(1\ 2)^\sigma. \tag{23}$$

Combining (19)–(23), we obtain the result as required.

Case 2. $c_n^\sigma = c_n^{-1}$ and $(c_n^{-1})^\sigma = c_n$.

Since σ swaps c_n and c_n^{-1}, as in Case 1, by considering the unique 12-cycle in Γ_n passing through e, c_n and c_n^{-1} we get

$$((1\ 2)c_n)^\sigma = (1\ 2)c_n^{-1} = (1\ 2)^\sigma c_n^\sigma,\ ((1\ 2)c_n^{-1})^\sigma = (1\ 2)c_n = (1\ 2)^\sigma(c_n^{-1})^\sigma; \tag{24}$$

$$(c_n^2)^\sigma = c_n^{-2} = c_n^\sigma c_n^\sigma,\ (c_n^{-2})^\sigma = c_n^2 = (c_n^{-1})^\sigma(c_n^{-1})^\sigma. \tag{25}$$

Also, by considering the two 12-cycles C_1 and C_2 (resp. C_1^* and C_2^*) passing through e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n (resp. e, $(1\ 2)$ and c_n^{-1}), we obtain

$$(c_n(1\ 2))^\sigma = c_n^{-1}(1\ 2) = c_n^\sigma(1\ 2)^\sigma \text{ and } (c_n^{-1}(1\ 2))^\sigma = c_n(1\ 2) = (c_n^{-1})^\sigma(1\ 2)^\sigma. \tag{26}$$

Combining (23)–(26), we obtain the result as required.

The proof is now complete. □

Remark 2. From the proof of Lemma 2.6 we see that each $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)_e$ ($n \geq 13$) must fix $(1\ 2) \in S$. Thus $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)_e$ is not transitive on the neighborhood of the identity vertex e, which implies that Γ_n is not arc-transitive.

By Lemma 2.6, Γ_n ($n \geq 13$) is a normal Cayley graph, so the full automorphism group of Γ_n is equal to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) = R(S_n) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S)$ by Godsil [11]. Thus, in order to determine $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)$, it suffices to determine the group $\mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S)$. The following lemma completely determine the group $\mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let S_n be the symmetric group of degree n, and let $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots\ n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ ($n \geq 3$). Then*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S) = \langle \mathrm{Inn}(\phi) \rangle,$$

where $\phi = (1\ 2)(3\ n)(4\ n{-}1)(5\ n{-}2)\cdots\ (\in S_n)$, and $\mathrm{Inn}(\phi)$ denotes the inner isomorphism of S_n induced by ϕ.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S)$. Then $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(S_n)$ and $S^\varphi = S$. Since φ cannot sent $(1\ 2) \in S$ to a product of three disjoint transpositions (we only need to consider this situation when $n = 6$), from Lemma 2.3 we know that $\varphi \in \mathrm{Inn}(S_n)$, and so there exists some $\phi \in S_n$ such that $\varphi = \mathrm{Inn}(\phi)$. Thus $S^\varphi = \phi^{-1}S\phi = S$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\phi^{-1}(1\ 2\ 3\ \ldots\ n)\phi, \phi^{-1}(1\ n\ n-1\ \ldots\ 2)\phi, \phi^{-1}(1\ 2)\phi\} \\ = & \{(\phi(1)\ \phi(2)\ \phi(3)\ \ldots\ \phi(n)), (\phi(1)\ \phi(n)\ \phi(n-1)\ \ldots\ \phi(2)), (\phi(1)\ \phi(2))\} \\ = & \{(1\ 2\ 3\ \ldots\ n), (1\ n\ n-1\ \ldots\ 2), (1\ 2)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

According to (27), we have $(\phi(1)\ \phi(2)) = (1\ 2)$. Therefore, $\phi(1) = 1$ and $\phi(2) = 2$ or $\phi(1) = 2$ and $\phi(2) = 1$. Again by (27), the former case implies that $\phi = e$ while the later case implies that $\phi = (1\ 2)(3\ n)(4\ n-1)(5\ n-2)\cdots$. It follows our result. □

By Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7, we obtain the main result of this paper immediately.

Theorem 2.8. *Let* $S = \{c_n = (1\ 2 \ldots n), c_n^{-1}, (1\ 2)\}$ *and* $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ *(*$n \geq 13$*). Then*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) = R(S_n) \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(S_n, S) = R(S_n) \rtimes \langle \mathrm{Inn}(\phi) \rangle \cong S_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2,$$

where $R(S_n)$ *is the right regular representation of* S_n, $\phi = (1\ 2)(3\ n)(4\ n-1)(5\ n-2)\cdots$ $(\in S_n)$, *and* $\mathrm{Inn}(\phi)$ *is the inner isomorphism of* S_n *induced by* ϕ.

Remark 3. It is worth mentioning that the conclusion of Theorem 2.8 also holds for $\mathrm{Cay}(S_n, S)$ with $S = \{c_n, c_n^{-1}, (i\ i+1)\}$.

Remark 4. Noting that Theorem 2.8 gives the automorphism group of Γ_n for $n \geq 13$. For $n \leq 12$, by using the package "grape" of GAP4 [10], we obtain that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) \cong D_6$ if $n = 3$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n) \cong S_n \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ if $4 \leq n \leq 8$; however, to determine the automorphism group of Γ_n for $9 \leq n \leq 12$ is beyond the capacity of our computer.

References

[1] B. Alspach, Point-symmetric graphs and digraphs of prime order and transitive permutation groups of prime degree, J. Combin. Theory 15 (1973) 12–17.

[2] E. Dobson, D. Witte, Transitive permutation groups of prime-squared degree, J. Algebraic Combin. 16 (2002) 43–69.

[3] S.F. Du, R.J. Wang, M.Y. Xu, On the normality of Cayley digraphs of order twice a prime, Austral. J. Combin. 18 (1998) 227–234.

[4] Y.P. Deng, X.D. Zhang, Automorphism group of the derangement graph, Electron. J. Combin. 18 (2011) #P198.

[5] Y.P. Deng, X.D. Zhang, Automorphism groups of the pancake graphs, Inf. Process. Lett. 112 (2012) 264–266.

[6] Y.Q. Feng, Automorphism groups of Cayley graphs on symmetric groups with generating transposition sets, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 96 (2006) 67–72.

[7] Y.Q. Feng, Z.P. Lu, M.Y. Xu, Automorphism groups of Cayley digraphs, in: J. Koolen, J.H. Kwak, M.Y. Xu (Eds.), Application of Group Theory to Combinatorics, Taylor & Francis Group, London, 2008, pp. 13–25.

[8] A. Ganesan, Automorphism groups of Cayley graphs generated by connected transposition sets, Discrete Math. 313 (2013) 2482–2485.

[9] A. Ganesan, Automorphism group of the complete transposition graph, J. Algebraic Combin. 42 (2015) 793–801.

[10] The GAP Group, GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.8.4, 2016, http://www.gap-system.org.

[11] C.D. Godsil, On the full automorphism group of a graph, Combinatorica 1 (1981) 243–256.

[12] C.D. Godsil, G. Royle, Algebraic Graph Theory, in: Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 207, Springer, New York, 2001.

[13] X.Y. Huang, Q.X. Huang, Automorphism group of the complete alternating group graph, submitted manuscript arXiv:1605.06664v2 [math.CO].

[14] J.S. Jwo, S. Lakshmivarahan, S.K. Dhall, A new class of interconnection networks based on the alternating group, Networks 23 (1993) 315–326.

[15] A. Korchmaros, I. Kovács, Automorphism groups of Cayley graphs generated by block transpositions and regular Cayley maps, Discrete Math. 340 (2017) 3125–3139.

[16] S. Lakshmivarahan, J.S. Jwo, S.K Dhall, Symmetry in interconnection networks based on Cayley graphs of permutation groups: A survey, Parallel Compu. 19 (1993) 361–407.

[17] Z.P. Lu, M.Y. Xu, On the normality of Cayley graphs of order pq, Austral. J. Combin. 27 (2003) 81–93.
[18] M. Suzuki, Group Theory I, Springer, New York, 1982.
[19] M.Y. Xu, Automorphism groups and isomorphisms of Cayley digraphs, Discrete Math. 182 (1998) 309–319.
[20] Z. Zhang, Q.X. Huang, Automorphism groups of bubble sort graphs and modified bubble sort graphs, Adv. Math. (China) 34(4) (2005) 441–447.
[21] J.X. Zhou, The automorphism group of the alternating group graph, Appl. Math. Lett. 24 (2011) 229–231.